

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

224



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,323	10/18/2001	Richard Dean Dettinger	ROC920010241US1	6608
7590 08/19/2004 Gero G. McClellan Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P. Suite 1500 3040 Post Oak Boulevard Houston, TX 77056-6582			EXAMINER SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,323

Applicant(s)

DETTINGER, RICHARD DEAN

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/17/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1-1) Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shulman et al (US 6311323, filed Sep 7, 1997).

Regarding claim 1, 20, Shulman teaches [in response to] receiving ... environment (ie., user input to computer system ... keyboard and/or pointing device used to highlight or select options)(col 6, lines 55-56).

Shulman teaches determining ... location (ie., context ... determined)(col 17, lines 33-49; fig 7, item 740).

Shulman teaches determining ... context (ie., finite list of declared entities .. at present character location)(col 4, lines 48-52).

Shulman teaches determining ... terms (ie., determination ... high level compilation ... instantly resolved ... definition)(col 5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 2, 14, 22, Shulman teaches plurality of ... input location (ie., selection menu shows list entities valid options at the present character)(col 4, lines 48-55).

Regarding claims 3, 23, Shulman teaches determining ... method (ie., present character position cursor ... statement)(col 4, lines 50-52).

Shulman teaches if so, selecting ... methods (ie., all callable procedures in the VBA library)(col 19, 1-5).

Regarding claim 7, Shulman teaches identifying ... context ... dynamically ... terms (ie., finite list of declared entities ... at present character location)(col 4, lines 48-5). The finite list is updated with entities from the programming environment.

Regarding claims 8, 26, Shulman teaches determining a cursor location (ie., cursor location)(col 4, line 51).

Regarding claim 12, Shuman teaches a memory ... persistent between programming environments (ie., assistant window continues to update ... includes any finite list of previously declared entities ...)(col 4, lines 44-55; col 5, lines 1-20).

Shulman teaches [in response to] receiving ... environment (ie., user input to computer system ... keyboard and/or pointing device used to highlight or select options)(col 6, lines 55-56).

Shulman teaches determining ... variable dictionary (ie., context ... determined)(col 17, lines 33-49; fig 7, item 740)(ie., finite list of declared entities .. at present character location)(col 4, lines 48-52).

Shulman teaches determining ... terms (ie., determination ... high level compilation ... instantly resolved ... definition)(col 5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 15, Shulman teaches Shulman teaches determining ... method (ie., present character position cursor ... statement)(col 4, lines 50-52).

Shulman teaches if so, selecting ... program methods (ie., local program definition or a global library definition – the global library does not change according to the local program environment)(col 5, lines 40-50).

Regarding claim 30, Shulman teaches in response ... determining ... location (ie., context ... determined)(col 17, lines 33-49; fig 7, item 740).

Shulman teaches determining ... context (ie., finite list of declared entities .. at present character location)(col 4, lines 48-5)(ie., determination ... high level compilation ... instantly resolved ... definition)(col 5, lines 39-50).

Shulman teaches outputting ... information (ie., pass through .. error flagged)(col 3, line 50).

Regarding claim 31, Shulman teaches determining ... location (ie., selection menu shows list entities valid options at the present character)(col 4, lines 48-55).

Regarding claims 32, Shulman teaches determining ... method (ie., present character position cursor ... statement)(col 4, lines 50-52).

Shulman teaches if so, selecting ... method code (ie., all callable procedures in the VBA library)(col 19, 1-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2-1) Claims 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 21, 27, 28, 29, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulman (as cited above),

Regarding claims 6, 13, Shulman teaches visually ... information (ie., pass through .. error flagged)(col 3, line 50), but does not expressly teach visually indicating. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that the visual indicator for the purpose of notifying a programmer of errors in their code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to incorporate a visual indicator for errors flagged for the purpose recognized in the art of Shulman, as discussed above.

Regarding claims 21, Shulman teaches outputting ... information (ie., pass through .. error flagged)(col 3, line 50), but does not expressly teach visually indicating. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that the visual indicator for the purpose of notifying a programmer of errors in their code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to incorporate a visual indicator for errors flagged for the purpose recognized in the art of Shulman, as discussed above.

Regarding claim 9, 18, 34, Shulman teaches determining a scope for the cursor location (ie., at the cursor position user types sufficient characters to force the tool to select the desired match – the system determines the scope of the characters entered; Anticipation typing)(col 9, line 60-65), but does not expressly teach scope. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that determining the scope for the purpose of anticipating the typing by the user to figure out valid suggestions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Shulman to include figuring out the scope for the purpose recognized in the art of Shulman, as disclosed above.

Regarding claims 10, 19, 28, Shulman teaches plurality ... another scope (ie., anticipation typed characters ... narrow list of items)(col 10, 9-15; fig 4, box of list to select the word to be placed in the editor), but does not expressly teach moving the cursor and changing the scope accordingly. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that the change of scope occurs in response to the cursor moving occurs as the user types in more characters for the purpose anticipating the potential word for the user to choose from and narrow/exapand the choices/scope of selection of valid words that the user can enter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Shulman to include changing the scope as the user types in more characters for the purpose recognized in the art Shulman, as discussed above.

Regarding claim 11, 29, Shulman teaches plurality ... scope (ie., cursor is placed within the programming language statement)(col 13, lines 1-5), but does not

Art Unit: 2176

expressly teach remain unchanged. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that the change of scope does not occur in response to the cursor moving as the user types in more characters for the purpose of selecting from only a finite list that does not suggest more or less choices for the user as the user types more characters.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Shulman to include not adding/subtracting from the list of choices for the user as the user enters more characters for the purpose recognized in the art of Shulman, as discussed above.

Regarding claims 27, Shulman teaches determining a cursor location (ie., cursor location)(col 4, line 51).

Shulman teaches determining a scope for the cursor location (ie., at the cursor position user types sufficient characters to force the tool to select the desired match – the system determines the scope of the characters entered; Anticipation typing)(col 9, line 60-65) but does not expressly teach scope. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that determining the scope for the purpose of anticipating the typing by the user to figure out valid suggestions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Shulman to include figuring out the scope for the purpose recognized in the art of Shulman, as disclosed above.

2-2) Claims 4, 16, 24, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulman (as cited above), in view of Fontaine et al (US 5228121, issued Jul 1993).

Regarding claim 4, 24, Shulman does not expressly teach but Fontaine teaches determining ... comment (ie., determination if line of input is a comment)(col 3, line 68). Specifically, Shulman teaches the general programming environment. It is a common practice in the art to include comments in programs and those comments are seen as flat text by any text editor. One can place a cursor in the comment section and the noncommented program section.

Shulman teaches if so ... terms (ie., characters in each line of code compiled against a local program definition or global library definition)(col 5, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include determination if a line of input is a comment as taught by Fontaine, providing the benefit of productivity increases manifolds in writing tools such as editors and text processors (Fontaine, col 2, lines 44-45) where programmer enters language statements in a manual process in an editor/text processor of some sort (Shulman, col 1, lines 30-38).

Regarding claim 16, Shulman does not expressly teach but Fontaine teaches determining ... comment (ie., determination if line of input is a comment)(col 3, line 68). Specifically, Shulman teaches the general programming environment. It is a common practice in the art to include comments in programs and those comments are seen as

Art Unit: 2176

flat text by any text editor. One can place a cursor in the comment section and the noncommented program section.

Shulman teaches if so ... terms (ie., characters in each line of code compiled against a local program definition or global library definition)(col 5, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include determination if a line of input is a comment as taught by Fontaine, providing the benefit of productivity increases manifolds in writing tools such as editors and text processors (Fontaine, col 2, lines 44-45) where programmer enters language statements in a manual process in an editor/text processor of some sort (Shulman, col 1, lines 30-38).

Regarding claim 33, Shulman does not expressly teach but Fontaine teaches determining ... comment (ie., determination if line of input is a comment)(col 3, line 68). Specifically, Shulman teaches the general programming environment. It is a common practice in the art to include comments in programs and those comments are seen as flat text by any text editor. One can place a cursor in the comment section and the noncommented program section.

Shulman teaches if so ... keyword dictionary (ie., characters in each line of code compiled against a local program definition or global library definition)(col 5, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include determination if a line of input is a comment as taught by Fontaine, providing the benefit of productivity increases manifolds in writing

Art Unit: 2176

tools such as editors and text processors (Fontaine, col 2, lines 44-45) where programmer enters language statements in a manual process in an editor/text processor of some sort (Shulman, col 1, lines 30-38).

2-3) Claims 5, 17, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulman (as cited above), in view of Sonderegger (US 5893118, issued Apr 6, 1999).

Regarding claim 5, 25, Shulman teaches determining ... method (ie., present character position cursor ... statement)(col 4, lines 50-52).

Shulman teaches if so, selecting ... methods (ie., all callable procedures in the VBA library)(col 19, 1-5).

Shulman does not expressly teach, but Sonderegger teaches if the location ... selecting ... program methods (ie., native code library ... Java library)(col 9, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include native code and java libraries as taught by Sonderegger, providing the benefit of a novel method for managing Java classes which are distributed in a computer network (Sonderegger, col 5, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 17, Shulman teaches determining ... method (ie., present character position cursor ... statement)(col 4, lines 50-52).

Shulman teaches if so, selecting ... program methods (ie., local program definition or a global library definition – the global library does not change according to the local program environment)(col 5, lines 40-50).

Shulman does not expressly teach, but Sonderegger teaches if the location ... selecting ... program methods (ie., native code library ... Java library)(col 9, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include native code and java libraries as taught by Sonderegger, providing the benefit of a novel method for managing Java classes which are distributed in a computer network (Sonderegger, col 5, lines 1-5).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6.5-


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER